I	1		
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
2	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA		
3	RICHMOND DIVISION		
4			
5			
6	ePLUS, INC. : Civil Action No. : 3:09CV620		
7	vs. :		
8	LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC. : January 4, 2011		
9	· 		
10			
11	COMPLETE TRANSCRIPT OF THE JURY TRIAL		
12	BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. PAYNE		
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE, AND A JURY		
14			
15	APPEARANCES:		
16	Scott L. Robertson, Esquire Michael G. Strapp, Esquire		
17	Jennifer A. Albert, Esquire David M. Young, Esquire		
18	Goodwin Procter, LLP 901 New York Avenue NW		
19	Suite 900 Washington, D.C. 20001		
20	Craig T. Merritt, Esquire		
21	Christian & Barton, LLP 909 East Main Street		
22	Suite 1200 Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095		
23	Counsel for the plaintiff		
24	Peppy Peterson, RPR		
25	Official Court Reporter United States District Court		

```
APPEARANCES: (cont'g)
 1
 2
     Dabney J. Carr, IV, Esquire
     Troutman Sanders, LLP
 3
     Troutman Sanders Building
     1001 Haxall Point
     Richmond, Virginia 23219
 4
5
     Daniel W. McDonald, Esquire
     Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, Esquire
     William D. Schultz, Esquire
 6
     Merchant & Gould, PC
     80 South Eighth Street
 7
     Suite 3200
     Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Civil action number 3:09CV00620, ePlus,
Incorporated versus Lawson Software, Incorporated. Mr. Scott
L. Robertson, Mr. Craig T. Merritt, Ms. Jennifer A. Albert, Mr.
Michael G. Strapp, and Mr. David Young represent the plaintiff.

Mr. Daniel W. McDonald, Dabney J. Carr, IV, Ms.

Kirstin L. Stoll-DeBell, and Mr. William D. Schultz represent
the defendant. Are counsel ready to proceed?

MR. ROBERTSON: Yes, Your Honor, plaintiff is.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. On behalf of the Court and counsel and the parties, I'd like to thank you for your participation this morning in one of the most important civic duties that citizens of our country have.

We are a society which has chosen to rule itself in accord with the rule of law, and we have taken in our Constitution and our laws measures to make sure that we have an effective legal system by which people can resolve their disputes in court rather than in the streets, and if we did not have the service of jurors to make the sacrifices that jurors are called upon to do so, then our system of justice that is administered in accord with our Constitution and our statutes could not exist.

And so what you are called upon to do is a public duty of the highest order which, of course, all of us know entail sacrifices for you and for your families and for your employers and imposes burdens upon you beyond that of the ordinary responsibilities that you have which are already significant, and all of us know that.

This case involves a dispute over patents. There are -- the plaintiff here is ePlus, Incorporated, or Inc., and ePlus, whose lawyers are sitting over here, has some patents that are issued by the United States Patent Office, a process that is sanctioned and approved by the Constitution of the country and the laws of the nation, and the patents all are long-numbered.

They have six figures, and, in fact, I expect most of us would like to earn incomes in accord with the size of the numbers of these patents, but they are referred to by three small digits, the last three digits of the patent. I don't know that any of you know anything about these patents, but I want to let you know and understand what these patents are.

There's a patent number 6023683 which is called the '683 patent. There's patent number 6055516 or the '516 patent. There's patent number 6505172 or the '172 patent. Sometimes, patents may be referred to, instead of using these short numbers, '516 or '683 as the patents-in-suit. That's just a term that lawyers sometimes use to talk about the patents that

are the subject of the case, or they may be called the ePlus patents.

Now, all three of these patents in this case relate to what is called, and you'll come to learn, as electronic sourcing and procurement software, systems, and methods, software, systems, and methods, all three, and the parties are going to, through the trial, offer testimony to explain what all that is.

Now, I'm going to now show for you a -- and you can look up at those big televisions there. You all will be better off looking that way, most of you will, and you'll be better off looking that way -- a CD that sort of explains the patent system and what it is that has given rise to the situation in which we all find ourselves today.

Would it help if I turned the lights off back there?

I've never really looked at them. It would? All right, turn
those lights off, please.

How about that; is that better? Now, who is playing the CD for us? All right, would you go ahead.

(DVD played for jury.)

THE COURT: Mr. Neal, will you please call the roll.

THE CLERK: Yes, sir, Your Honor. Ladies and gentlemen of the jury panel, as I call your name, would you please stand, answer present, and then be seated. Sarah Dolphin. I'm sorry. Sarah Abernathy.

1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
2	THE CLERK: That's where you live. Sarah Abernathy.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
4	THE CLERK: John Abrams, John Abrams?
5	(No response.)
6	THE CLERK: John Apostle, II.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
8	THE CLERK: Charles Asbury.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Here.
10	THE CLERK: Tiffany Bowles.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
12	THE CLERK: Joan Boyd.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
14	THE CLERK: Lisa Briscoe.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
16	THE CLERK: Constance Campbell.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
18	THE CLERK: Peggy Carrington.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
20	THE CLERK: Brenton Carson.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
22	THE CLERK: Rebecca Carter.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
24	THE CLERK: Kristin Caufield.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.

ļ		
1	THE CLERK:	Tamara Cebrian.
2	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
3	THE CLERK:	Jason Chalmers.
4	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
5	THE CLERK:	Luther Clary.
6	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
7	THE CLERK:	Lindsey Comer.
8	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
9	THE CLERK:	Richard Compher.
10	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
11	THE CLERK:	Jerry Dawson.
12	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
13	THE CLERK:	Gardner Divers.
14	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
15	THE CLERK:	Ruth Downs.
16	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
17	THE CLERK:	Eric Ellingson.
18	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
19	THE CLERK:	Carrie Emerson.
20	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
21	THE CLERK:	Sandra Gumm.
22	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
23	THE CLERK:	Zelma Hatcher.
24	PROSPECTIVE	JUROR: Present.
25	THE CLERK:	Kathryn Horne.

	II	
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
2	THE CLERK: Kathlee	en Hribar.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
4	THE CLERK: Hugh Hu	itcherson.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
6	THE CLERK: Daniell	e Jones.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
8	THE CLERK: Ronda J	Tones.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
10	THE CLERK: Stephan	ie Jones.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
12	THE CLERK: Gregory	Kiersarsky.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
14	THE CLERK: Joan Ki	nzie.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
16	THE CLERK: Kevin I	dewis, Sr.
17	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
18	THE CLERK: Joyce M	larsh.
19	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
20	THE CLERK: Jon Mey	ers.
21	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
22	THE CLERK: Linda M	Mitchell.
23	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.
24	THE CLERK: Carole	Mitchell.
25	PROSPECTIVE JUROR:	Present.

1	THE CLERK: Melissa Moore.
2	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
3	THE CLERK: Debra Mosby. Debra Mosby.
4	(No response.)
5	THE CLERK: John Murgatroyd.
6	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
7	THE CLERK: Timothy Newton.
8	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
9	THE CLERK: Karen Ott.
10	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
11	THE CLERK: Kathy Pearce.
12	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
13	THE CLERK: Charonda Penn. Charonda Penn.
14	(No response.)
15	THE CLERK: Philip Pollack.
16	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
17	THE CLERK: Erika Powell.
18	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
19	THE CLERK: Betty Raymond.
20	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
21	THE CLERK: Monica Redwood.
22	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
	II
23	THE CLERK: Desiree Roberts.
23 24	THE CLERK: Desiree Roberts. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.

ı	
1	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
2	THE CLERK: Denise Robinson.
3	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
4	THE CLERK: Sinden Schoedel.
5	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
6	THE CLERK: Robin Silberman.
7	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
8	THE CLERK: Marchelle Sossong.
9	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
10	THE CLERK: Josephine Strulson.
11	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
12	THE CLERK: Heather Traylor.
13	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
14	THE CLERK: Leanne Wight.
15	PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Present.
16	THE CLERK: Are there any jurors present in the
17	courtroom whose name I did not call? Any jurors present in the
18	courtroom whose name I did not call? Thank you.
19	Now, ladies and gentlemen, if you would please stand
20	and raise your right hand, and after the oath is administered,
21	if you'll verbally respond I shall.
22	(Jury panel sworn.)
23	THE CLERK: Thank you. Please be seated.
24	THE COURT: Juror number 60, is your last name Wright
25	or Wight?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's Wight.

THE COURT: W-i-g-h-t?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, as you know now, the case is about patent infringement, and someone is said to be infringing on the claims of a patent. Remember the video said the part where the invention is disclosed, the part of the deed of patent that contains the /TPEFS, the elements and the boundaries, are called the claims, and it's the claims that are alleged to be infringed.

And so it's said that I am infringing a claim if I, without the permission of the patent owner, import, make, use, offer to sell, or sell the patented invention or product made by a patented process as defined by those claims, and if I do that within the United States, and if I do that while the patent is extant, that is before the patent expires -- you remember the video said most patents go for 20 years. So after 20 years, I could go in, and if you have a patent, after 20 years, most of the time I can come in and just use your patent and product, and I don't have to pay you a royalty or do anything. I just get the right to use it.

All right, now, a patent, as you learned in the video, is presumed to be valid. That presumption of validity, however, can be overcome if it is clearly and convincingly shown that the patent is invalid. The person who is suing for

infringement has to prove that infringement has occurred. The person who is accused of infringement -- here, that's the defendant, Lawson -- can also say, I didn't infringe, and they can deny infringement, and then it's up to the party, ePlus, who has the patent to say, yes, you are, and to prove that.

But if Lawson can also say, well, that patent is invalid, so even if I'm infringing it, it's no good, you can't sue me, you can't get any really judgment against me. It's up to Lawson to prove clearly and convincingly that the patent is invalid, because it is presumed that the patent is valid.

Now, I've told you before about the numbers of the patents. The parties are ePlus, Inc., and Lawson Software, Inc., and ePlus contends that Lawson makes, uses, offers to sell, or sells products and methods that infringe certain claims of certain patents.

They allege that claim three, 26, 28, and 29 of '683 patent is alleged -- is infringed. They allege that claims one, two, six, nine, 21, 22, and 29 of the '516 patent are infringed, and they allege, ePlus does, that claim one of the '172 patent is infringed.

To determine infringement, what you have to do is to compare the accused products and methods, that is Lawson's products and the methods used by Lawson with the claim that that method or product is alleged to infringe. There's -- you don't compare Lawson's products and ePlus's products. You

compare the claims against what are called the accused products or methods.

In your notebook, there's a list of the terms that are used in the claims. Now, the terms sometimes are not the easiest things to understand, and it has been the job of the Court to determine what those claim terms mean, and I've decided that, and in the notebook of those nine of you who will hear the case is a list of what those claim terms mean, and you are obligated when you get into the jury box to follow what those terms mean, not what you think they mean, but what the Court says they mean.

From time to time, some of these witnesses are going to use the same words that the claim terms use, and there are going to be some documents maybe that have those terms in them. It doesn't necessarily mean that the use given by those witnesses or documents is the same that the Court has given the meaning, so you should not assume that a witness or documents use of a word or a phrase that is in the claim term necessarily has the same meaning that the word or phrase within the claim term that the Court has construed.

Now, you heard the video talk about boundaries, what is the boundary of the claim. That defines what the owner of the patent has been awarded a patent on. A patent is infringed only if Lawson's products or methods includes each and every element of a claim that is alleged to be infringed. So if, for

example, a claim has five elements, let's say, for example, and ePlus proves that four of those elements are exactly covered by the patent but doesn't prove to your satisfaction that the fifth element is covered, then there isn't any infringement, and that's because ePlus has to prove all of the elements of the claim are being infringed, and you have to do that, decide that with respect to each claim for each of the patents.

Now, ePlus also contends that Lawson is indirectly infringing these claims by contributing to or inducing third parties to make and use products or methods incorporating the patented inventions. In this case, what that really means is that Lawson is working with its customers, and when they do certain things, they're infringing the patent together.

It is the customers that are alleged third parties; isn't that right, Mr. McDonald, in this case? There isn't anybody else.

MR. McDONALD: Yes, I believe that's the allegation.

THE COURT: So you'll hear evidence about that, too,
and I'm going to give you instruction about indirect
infringement as well.

Now, Lawson, on the other hand, says and denies that its infringing any claim of any of the ePlus patents either directly, that is by itself, or indirectly, that is by what it's doing with its customers, or by what it's telling its customers to do.

Lawson also contends that these asserted claims, every one of them, are invalid. You remember the video mentioned invalidity, and they base a claim of invalidity on three basic doctrines which I'm going to explain to you later, but you'll hear the lawyers mention them in their opening statements. There's invalidity on the theory of anticipation. That means -- I'll give you instructions on that later.

It's invalid, they say, upon a theory of obviousness, and it's invalid for -- some of the claims are invalid, excuse me, because there's a lack of a written description that is adequate under the patent law.

And as that -- I'll give you further instruction on that. But even though the PTO examiner has allowed some of the claims here, it's up to you, the jury, to decide whether or not the patent is invalid for the reasons alleged by Lawson.

Now, I don't know whether the lawyers -- I do know, so never mind. There's also -- I'm not going to get into that because I realize yesterday I told them they can't do it.

Now, that's sort of a background of where you're going, and it's a hard job that you are being asked to do. Any time you are serving on a jury it's a hard job, and you're going to need to pay attention. The lawyers have worked hard to try to get this case down to a manageable level, and they've been working on it for a good while, and they anticipate that the trial of this case will take approximately three weeks. It

maybe a little bit longer, it maybe a little bit less, so they're going to do everything they can consistent with their obligations to represent their clients and their client's interest, which is what the law requires that they do, to present the case efficiently and expeditiously, and I'm going to do the same thing to see that they move things along.

Nonetheless, as you can tell from what I've told you, and you'll be able to tell a little bit later for those of you who are selected, it is a fairly complex set of questions that have to be decided by the jury, and it will take some time to hear the evidence and decide it.

Now, we're about to begin a process called voir dire examination of the jury, and unlike what you've seen on television, it isn't unduly long, and I hope it's not unduly intrusive. Indeed, I've tried to frame the questions in a way that if you have to give an answer, you can stand, give me your name, and answer the question.

I may have some follow-up questions, but there may be questions -- I don't know that there will be. There may be questions which involve personal matters on your part that you would rather not state openly, and that's fine. In that case, you come up here, and you will talk right here at the bench and take your answer there.

This examination is important for several reasons. First, there are reasons at law why people can't sit as jurors

in a case, and my questions are designed, in part, to find out if there's any reason why any of you could not sit as a juror. For example, if you are related to a witness or to a lawyer or own stock in one of the companies, you can't sit as a juror. The law says you can't, and so my questions are designed to see if there are any of you who not only have those situations but others.

In addition to that, in our system of justice, the parties, through their lawyers, have the right to participate in deciding who among your number actually sits in trial and judgment in this case.

They do that by having or exercising what are called peremptory challenges. That is to say after we have a certain number of you in the box, which -- and your names are drawn by lot, they can say, I don't want this person, that person, or this person to sit on the jury, and they can do that for a good reason, a bad reason, or no reason at all, which one hopes they don't do, so long as it is not an unconstitutional or unlawful reason.

They don't have a lot of these challenges, so it's very important that they have information so that they can use them or not or decide not to use them on the basis of deliberate and careful and meaningful thought, and to that end, they have all been given copies of some extracted information, some of the information you provided in response to your jury

questionnaire. They weren't given all of it, but they were given some of it.

I know it's been a long time since you lined up in alphabetical order and stood up and said present when your name is called, but there's a reason for that. I've found over the years that the lawyers can more quickly put together the information that they already have about you with your name and your face and the information they learn today from you if you are seated in this order, and that's why I've asked you to do that, because, as I said, they do need to make these challenges intelligently because they don't have very many of them.

The first thing I'm going to ask them to do is to stand, to introduce themselves and the lawyers and legal assistants that there at the table with them in the case, who will be here during the case, excuse me, and to introduce their client representatives so that you'll have -- I'll have some questions for you, and we'll start over here with the plaintiff. Mr. Merritt, are you starting? Okay.

MR. MERRITT: Yes, sir. Good morning. My name is Craig Merritt. I am with the Christian & Barton law firm here in Richmond, Virginia. Our lead counsel, Scott Robertson, Jennifer Albert, are with the Goodwin Procter law firm in Washington, D.C. We also are going to have with us during the trial Michael Strapp, also with Goodwin Procter, and David Young from Goodwin Procter.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Robin Randolph is a legal assistant with my law firm here in Richmond. Ken Farber, who is sitting in the back row here, is a representative who is here from ePlus during the trial. THE COURT: Who is this gentleman that's probably doing most important job in the courtroom? Would you introduce yourself, please. MR. GREER: I'm Mike Greer. I'm with trial practice. THE COURT: All right. Mr. -- who is going to do it over here for you all? All right, Mr. McDonald. MR. McDONALD: My name is Dan McDonald. I'm an attorney from Minnesota. With me is Kirstin Stoll-DeBell. THE COURT: Stand up there so they can see you, Ms. Stoll-Debell. MR. McDONALD: She's from Denver. Representative of Lawson Software, Dale Christopherson; Dabney Carr, counsel here in Richmond, and Will Schultz, and our technology here, Bill Mayleben, and representing Lawson also from time to time is Bruce McPheeters. THE COURT: All right. MR. McDONALD: Maggie Martinez is our paralegal here who you'll see moving around the courtroom. The name of your firm? THE COURT: MR. McDONALD: Merchant & Gould. THE COURT: And it's headquartered in Minneapolis.

1 MR. McDONALD: Correct. 2 THE COURT: And the name of Mr. Carr's firm is 3 Troutman Sanders. 4 MR. CARR: That's right. 5 THE COURT: All right. First question I have, ladies and gentlemen, is whether you, any of you know any of the 6 7 lawyers or legal assistants or technical people who have been 8 introduced today in the case. In the back there. 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Josephine Strulson. 10 THE COURT: Okay, just a minute. All right, whom do 11 you know, Ms. Strulson? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know Mr. Dabney Carr. 13 THE COURT: And how do you know Mr. Carr? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work at Troutman Sanders. 14 15 THE COURT: You do? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 17 THE COURT: Okay. I don't believe I need to ask you 18 any more questions. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. THE COURT: I wish I had known that. We could have 20 21 excused you earlier. 22 THE CLERK: What number is she, Your Honor? 23 THE COURT: Number 58. 24 THE CLERK: Thank you. 25 THE COURT: Anybody else know any of the lawyers in

the case? All right. Now, have I got the total -- there's just one defendant; right, Mr. Carr?

MR. CARR: That's right.

THE COURT: Has anybody been employed by, in the past or now, or do you have any family who has been employed by, in the past or now, or any close friends -- and when I say close friends in these questions I mean people whom you pay attention to and who influence your judgment -- who have been employed by ePlus, Inc., or by Lawson Software, Inc.? Anybody? No.

Is there anybody here who owns stock in or has ever been an officer in or has ever owned stock in ePlus or Lawson, or is there anybody in your family, to your knowledge, who owns stock in either of those corporations? The answer is no.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I want to point out something else. A lot of these questions, like do you know the lawyers, for the most part we know statistically the answer is no, so for the most -- unless somebody stands up and said they do, if everybody just sits and remains silent, it means you are giving a no answer, and we'll record a no answer for you.

But there's some questions statistically we know, such as have you been on a jury before, that many of the jurors may very well have been on a jury, and in that instance, what I do is start pointing with my pen down here with juror number one, and I come right across the way, and when I come to you, if the answer for you is yes, you stand up, you give me your

name, I have some follow-up. When we finish with you, you can sit down, and then I go right on across here, and I do that each row, and that way we make sure we get everybody.

Sometimes we'll get back to the back row, and it will be -- it will happen that somebody in the front row or before then realizes, you know, I should have said in response to that question or even to an earlier question, and if -- that happens all the time because sometimes something somebody else says prompts you to think of something that you ought to have disclosed, and if that happens, you raise your hand.

We'll get to you. People are watching. My staff up here is watching, and we'll get to you and get the answer and get it straight. The important thing is that we have the answer.

The other thing is, if you don't understand the question, you raise your hand and let me know, because it's probably my fault that I have not put the question correctly, and if you don't understand it, probably somebody else doesn't understand it as well. It is important, as I've told you, that you understand these questions so you can give meaningful answers to them, so you let us know. We're not in so much of a hurry that we don't want to do it right.

All right, has anybody or any of your family members or close friends to your knowledge ever been employed by either of the law firms, and the law firms in this case are, in

Richmond, Christian & Barton represents ePlus, and Troutman Sanders represents Lawson, and Goodwin Procter is headquartered -- or Mr. Robertson is in Washington, D.C., and Merchant & Gould is in Minneapolis. Has anybody ever been employed by any of those law firms? No, all right. Thank you.

Now, I gave all of you when you came in a list of witnesses. Is there anybody -- you've looked at those witnesses -- who believes that you know any of those witnesses? Most of the witnesses are not from this area. Is that a safe statement, counsel?

MS. ALBERT: (Indicating affirmatively.)

THE COURT: Anybody believe you know any of the witnesses, though? All right. Well, the answer to that is the jurors have had these lists, and they've looked at them, and the answer is, no, nobody knows any of the witnesses.

Have any of you served as a juror in a case, whether it's civil or criminal? There are two kinds of cases.

Basically a civil case is like this where a patent is involved or contracts, personal injury or property damage. Criminal is where there's an allegation of criminal conduct, and this counts -- this question includes whether you served as a juror in a federal court like this one or a court of any state in this country, or if you've been in the military, whether you've been a member of the court martial board.

So starting over here with juror number one, Ms.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Abernathy, if you have -- when I point to you, if you've ever
been a juror, stand and give me your name, and we'll go from
there. Starting there, anybody been a juror? Coming straight
down the line all the way across. Yes, ma'am, your name?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Constance Campbell.
          THE COURT: Ms. Campbell -- I'll get back to this
other lady in a minute. Ms. Campbell, when and where were you
a juror?
          You can sit down over there. Is that Ms. Boyd?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
          THE COURT: Okay, have a seat. I'll get back to you.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In Richmond. It was many years
ago.
          THE COURT: It was in the state court?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I think it was Marshall
Street.
          THE COURT: The John Marshall Courts Building. Was
it a civil case or a criminal case.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Criminal.
          THE COURT: Was there anything about your service as
a juror in that case that would keep you from giving a fair
trial to the parties in this case?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
          THE COURT: Thank you. Back there to Ms. Boyd.
Boyd, when and where were you a juror?
```

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In Brunswick County. 2 THE COURT: Okay. 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Criminal. 4 THE COURT: All right. About how long ago was that? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Maybe last year. 6 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about your 7 service as a juror, Ms. Boyd, that would give you any 8 difficulty giving these people a fair trial in this case? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 10 THE COURT: Thank you very much. On down the front 11 row. Yes, ma'am. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Peggy Carrington. 13 THE COURT: Ms. Carrington, when and where were you a juror? 14 15 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nottoway County. 16 THE COURT: How long ago? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Many years ago, sir. 18 THE COURT: Is it a criminal or civil case? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Civil. 20 THE COURT: Is there anything about your service in 21 that case that would keep you from giving a fair trial to the 22 parties in this case? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 24 THE COURT: Thank you. On across the front row, 25 anybody been a juror? All the way across, yes, sir. Your

```
1
     name?
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Luther Clary.
 3
               THE COURT: Mr. Clary, when and where were you a
 4
     juror, sir?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Brunswick County.
               THE COURT: All right, about how long ago was that?
 6
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's been many years ago.
 8
     20-plus years probably.
               THE COURT: Was it civil or criminal?
 9
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Criminal.
               THE COURT: Was there anything about your service as
11
12
     a juror in that case, Mr. Clary, that would keep you from
13
     giving a fair trial to these parties?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
14
15
               THE COURT: Thank you very much. On across the front
16
     row. All right, sir.
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jerry Dawson.
18
               THE COURT: Mr. Dawson, when and where were you a
19
     juror?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Howard County, 30 years ago,
21
     criminal.
22
               THE COURT: Criminal case. Is there anything about
     that jury service that will keep you from giving a fair trial?
23
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
25
               THE COURT: Thank you very much. Second row, over
```

```
here, anybody on this side? Yes, ma'am, your name?
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Ruth Downs.
 3
               THE COURT: Ms. Downs, when and where were you a
 4
     juror?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Many years ago up in Maryland.
               THE COURT: All right.
 6
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Civil and criminal.
 8
               THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about your
     service in that case that would give you any problems giving a
 9
10
     fair trial to these people?
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
12
               THE COURT: On across the second row. Yes, ma'am,
13
     your name?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kathryn Horne.
15
               THE COURT: Ms. Horne, when and where were you a
16
     juror?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Petersburg Circuit Court about
18
     20 years ago.
19
               THE COURT: And was it criminal or --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It was criminal.
20
21
               THE COURT: Is there anything about your service
     there that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these
22
23
     parties?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
               THE COURT: On down across the second row, anybody on
25
```

```
the second row? Okay. Third row, anybody on the third row
 2
     been a juror? Yes, ma'am, your name?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Carole Mitchell.
 4
               THE COURT: Ms. Mitchell, when and where?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: October 2009, Henrico County,
     criminal.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: All right. Are you Carole Mitchell?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, Carole.
 9
               THE COURT: And it was a criminal case, you say?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
11
               THE COURT: Is there anything about your service in
12
     that case that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these
13
     parties?
14
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
15
               THE COURT: On across here. Yes, sir, your name?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: John Murgatroyd. I have a
17
     question just for clarification.
18
               THE COURT: Yes, sir.
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: You asked about the military
     service and involvement with the court martial. Is that only
20
21
     as a jury member, sir?
22
               THE COURT: Yes.
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
               THE COURT: If you were the prosecuting attorney or
24
25
     defense attorney or a witness or even the accused, it doesn't
```

```
make any difference.
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you.
 3
               THE COURT: All right, on across. Yes, your name.
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Philip Pollack.
 5
               THE COURT: Mr. Pollack, when and where were you a
     juror?
 6
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Many years ago, City of Richmond,
 8
     two criminal and one civil.
 9
               THE COURT: Is there anything about your service in
10
     those cases that would keep you from giving a fair trial to
11
     these parties?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you. On across the way. All
     right. In the back row, anybody in the back row been a juror?
14
15
     Yes, ma'am.
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Marchelle Sossong.
17
               THE COURT: When and where, Ms. Sossong, were you a
18
     juror?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: About five years ago, Henrico
20
     County.
21
               THE COURT: Was it civil or criminal?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Civil.
               THE COURT: Anything about your service there that
23
     would keep you from giving a fair trial?
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
25
```

1 THE COURT: Anybody -- thank you very much. Anybody 2 else? Yes. Okay, yes, sir, your name? 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kevin Lewis. 4 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Lewis, when and where were 5 you a juror, sir? 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Richmond. 7 THE COURT: About how long ago was it? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm assuming 12 years. THE COURT: Was it civil or criminal? 9 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Civil. 11 THE COURT: Anything about your service in that case 12 that would keep you from giving a fair trial to the parties in this case? 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 14 15 THE COURT: Thank you very much. For those of you 16 who said you'd served as members of a civil jury, I know that 17 none of them were patent cases because they were all in the 18 state court, but did they, in any of the civil cases you were 19 involved in, involve intellectual property rights such as the 20 claim that somebody was entrenching on a trade secret or a 21 property, some kind of trade property of any kind? No, all 22 right. Thank you. 23 Now, I'd like to know at this time whether any of you have heard any publicity or any information about this case in 24 25 the newspapers or even while you were around the courthouse

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
this morning. If the answer is yes, let me know. Otherwise,
I'll record a no answer for you. I don't think there's
actually been publicity about it. All right, thank you.
                                                         The
answer is no.
         Have you or a family member or close friend ever been
employed by a company which either provides or sells computer
software or computer systems? If the answer is yes, let me
know. Starting over here as I point on the front row. Yes.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sarah Abernathy. My
brother-in-law was a -- worked for an internet service
provider.
         THE COURT: And what was the name of it; do you know?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's since folded.
remember the name of the company.
         THE COURT: Is there anything about that situation
that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
         THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Abernathy. On across the
front row, anybody? Yes, ma'am, your name?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Rebecca Carter. I work for Wells
Fargo trust department, and we have our own proprietary
software.
         THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about that
that would keep you from giving a fair trial?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
```

1 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody on the second row? Let me get to you since you're up. Your name? 2 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kristin Caufield. 4 THE COURT: All right, Ms. Caufield. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My dad works for a government contractor that sells computer software and securities systems. 6 7 THE COURT: And do you know what it is? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: He currently works for the 9 government. 10 THE COURT: And has that been -- do you know how long 11 it's been? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For the past four or five years. 13 THE COURT: Before that, do you remember any? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 14 15 THE COURT: Anything about that situation that would 16 keep you from giving a fair trial to either of these parties? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 18 THE COURT: Back here, was it Ms. Boyd, I believe? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I had two sisters who worked for IBM. 20 21 THE COURT: Did they work in the software area? 22 THE WITNESS: One of them did. THE COURT: Is there anything about that situation 23 that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties, 24 25 Ms. Boyd?

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: All right. Anybody else on that row? 2 3 the third row, anybody? Your name. 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kathleen Hribar. 5 THE COURT: Ms. Hribar, what is it? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I worked for 12 years for Brimmer 6 7 Corporation as a home care executive. 8 THE COURT: For what? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Brimmer Corporation. It's a 9 software vender of health care software. 10 11 THE COURT: Is there anything with your experience 12 there that would keep you from giving a fair trial? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 13 THE COURT: Did you work with the software part of 14 15 it, or did you work in some other area? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I worked with the software and 17 clinicians, physicians and nurses. 18 THE COURT: Did it involve procurement of any kind? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: On across the third row, anybody? Okay. 20 21 Yes, your name? 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Stephanie Jones. 23 THE COURT: Ms. Jones, what connection do you have? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father is a computer network 24 analyst. He doesn't actually sell systems, but he does work on 25

```
1
     them.
 2
               THE COURT: Okay. Are any of them Lawson systems?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No.
 4
               THE COURT: EPlus systems?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that I'm aware of, no.
               THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Would that
 6
 7
     keep you from giving a fair trial here?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
 9
               THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else? Yes, sir, your
10
     name.
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jon Meyers.
12
               THE COURT: Mr. Meyers, what about you?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work with a broker/dealer that
13
     has proprietary software as well.
14
15
               THE COURT: Do you work with the software?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
17
               THE COURT: Do they sell it or produce it?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's part of our system.
19
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that that would
20
     keep you from giving a fair trial?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
22
               THE COURT: Okay, on across. Your name?
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: John Murgatroyd. I've worked for
24
     Basic Commerce & Industries at Dahlgren, Virginia. I support
25
     the Department of Navy as a weapons systems engineer, and we
```

```
have -- we develop software, but we mostly act to inspect
 1
 2
     software that DOD or a DOD contractor has developed.
 3
               THE COURT: And does any of that involve procurement
     or sourcing software?
 4
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not directly, no. When I was
     active duty in the military, I was involved, but not --
 6
 7
               THE COURT: You were involved in what?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In aiding with procurement.
 9
               THE COURT: What did you procure?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Mostly weapons systems and
11
     Tomahawk cruise missiles systems.
               THE COURT: From specialty weapons people?
12
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
14
               THE COURT: Did you use Lawson or ePlus software in
15
     any way?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that I --
17
               THE COURT: Not that you know about, all right.
     Thank you very much. Yes, over here. That's Ms. Moore, is it?
18
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. My brother worked dozens of
     years ago in Silicon Valley designing software, and I don't
20
21
     remember the name of his company. And I also have a good
22
     friend who currently works for a company that contracts with
     the government designing software, but, again, I don't know the
23
24
     name of the company.
25
               THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about any
```

of that that would keep you from giving a fair trial? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 3 THE COURT: How about you, Mr. Murgatroyd, anything 4 about your background that would keep you from giving a fair trial? 5 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 7 THE COURT: Over here, yes, ma'am. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kathy Pearce. My daughter works 9 for a company and demos software, and she helped install it at one point in her career, SunGard Energy. 10 11 THE COURT: All right. Anything about that that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 13 No. 14 THE COURT: Anybody else? Yes, sir? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Philip Pollack. 15 16 THE COURT: Yes. 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Your Honor, repeat the exact question again, please. 18 THE COURT: Well, the question here, it's gotten a 19 20 little broader, but it's have you ever worked for a company 21 that provides or sells computer software systems. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, during college, years ago, I 22 23 was a summer programer for IBM. 24 THE COURT: Okay. Anything about that that would keep you from giving a fair trial? 25

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 2 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Anybody else? 3 Anybody in the last row? Your name? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Heather Traylor. 5 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, okay, got you. 6 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work for Graybar Electric, and 7 we contract E-TURN software. We also sell services for 8 e-procurement, and I'm the business development manager in 9 charge of that. 10 THE COURT: Are you familiar with either the Lawson 11 or the ePlus systems? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that I'm aware of. 13 THE COURT: What is the name of the system you used? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's called E-TURNS. 14 15 THE COURT: T-e-r-m? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: T-U-R-N-S. 17 THE COURT: Okay, E-TURNS. My quess is it's my 18 hearing, it's not you. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it's me. 20 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you very much. Anything 21 about that that would keep you from giving a fair trial to 22 these parties? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 24 THE COURT: Anybody else? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sinden Schoedel. I work for 25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Northrop Grumman. I don't personally install software, but my company does a great deal of it. I'm sorry, your name is what? THE COURT: PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sinden Schoedel. THE COURT: Anything about that employment that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. THE COURT: Okay. Based upon your answers, I think most of you have already answered this. If you've answered it previously, you don't need to, such as Ms. Traylor, I believe you've already answered this, but is anybody employed by a company which provides or sells electronic procurement or electronic sourcing software systems? And I know you've already answered that, Ms. Traylor. I'm going to start across the front row. answer is yes, let me know. Second row, no. Third row, no. Fourth row, we've already gotten the answer back there. Other than Ms. Traylor, is there anybody who has had to use electronic source-ware -- electronic sourcing software systems in connection with your work? If the answer is yes, let me know. Okay, yes, ma'am, your name? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Rebecca Carter. I uses software that we --THE COURT: You use -- and that's electronic sourcing software, so you go out and you shop and try to find things, do

1 you? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, but we have license 3 agreements. 4 THE COURT: But do you actually use it in your work? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 6 THE COURT: What do you do that you -- how do you use 7 it, I think, is what I'm trying to get at. 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Retirement plans, allocating 9 contributions, and making distributions. 10 THE COURT: But you don't buy things with it? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: THE COURT: Thank you very much. Has anybody used 12 13 the Lawson Software S3 Supply Chain Management system or the M3 Supply Chain Management system, or the Fisher Scientific RIMS 14 15 system or the IBM Technical Viewer/2, also known as TV/2 16 system, the P.O. Writer system, the J-CON Writer system or 17 ePlus Procure(plus) or ePlus Contents(plus) systems? Anybody 18 ever use that, any of those? The answer is no. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a question. 20 THE COURT: Yes, ma'am, Ms. Downs. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am so not into computers. 22 THE COURT: You're what? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm not into computers. THE COURT: Me either. 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do use a computer at my work,

```
and it just dawned on me, one of the things that we sign on is
     Lawson, and I don't know --
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Do you know what it is?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have no clue.
 5
               THE COURT: Do you ever use it?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I type my password in, and it's a
 6
 7
     medical office I work in.
 8
               THE COURT: What do you do?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm an office assistant in a
 9
     doctor's office.
10
11
               THE COURT: All right. So what do you do when you
12
     are doing that?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For the medical records on a
     patient, and I don't know if it's the same Lawson.
14
15
                           It may not be, but now we know as much as
               THE COURT:
16
     you know which is all anybody can ask of you.
17
               Yes, okay, stand up. Your name?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jon Meyers.
19
               THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Meyers.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When you were going through the
21
     examples, you mentioned Fisher Scientific as one of the
22
     examples.
23
               THE COURT: Yes, just a minute. I'll read the name
     exactly to you. Fisher Scientific R-I-M-S, RIMS.
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All I can tell you is I have a
```

```
friend who sells for Fisher Scientific. I don't have a clue
     about the specifics of that.
 2
 3
               THE COURT: Would that affect you in giving a fair
 4
     trial here?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all, sir.
               THE COURT: Have you heard him say anything good,
 6
 7
     bad, or indifferent about that system?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just what she gets paid.
 9
               THE COURT: That's good then, I guess. All right,
10
     has anybody here been educated in electronics or computer
11
     programming? If the answer is yes, give me your name. All
     right, back there in the back, your name, sir?
12
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Eric Ellingson.
               THE COURT: Mr. Ellingson, what kind of education
14
     have you had in that area?
15
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I work for a pharmaceutical
     company, and I work on systems, you know, some coding, you
17
18
     know, to help in those systems.
19
               THE COURT: How did you get trained in that?
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just through the vendor.
21
               THE COURT: Okay. Who is the vendor?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: LabWare based out of Delaware.
22
23
               THE COURT: Is there anything about that that would
     keep you from giving a fair trial here?
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: Anybody coming across? Yes, ma'am? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kathleen Hribar. When I worked for Cerner Corporation, I was trained in the coding and programming of those systems. THE COURT: Spell that name of that company. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: C-e-r-n-e-r. THE COURT: Did you actually do programming? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. THE COURT: Of their system? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Of their system. THE COURT: Is there anything about that that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. THE COURT: Anybody else on that row. Next row? All right, yes, sir, that's Mr. Murgatroyd; right? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. All DOD-related, but 27 years ion the Navy, I worked on communications systems, weapons systems, those kinds of things. At that time, I wasn't involved in any software writing or coding, but obviously, if there was a software glitch, we'd communicate with the shore folks who would tell us what the adjustments to make so we can go forward. Since retiring from the Navy in 2002, I've been working as a senior systems engineer out at Dahlgren laboratories in the development of the future weapons systems.

1 THE COURT: And you do programming? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I assist in programming. 3 THE COURT: Anything about that work that would keep 4 you from giving a fair trial to these parties? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, Your Honor. THE COURT: Yes, over there. That's Ms. Moore, is 6 7 it? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. One of my jobs is with a 9 nonprofit, and I have been trained by them to manage and to 10 help program their case management software. 11 THE COURT: Is there anything about that situation 12 that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. 13 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, sir, right there in the 14 15 front row. What is your name? 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Brenton Carson. 17 THE COURT: Yes. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Engineering student for a couple 19 years at Virginia Commonwealth University, and I took a few 20 basic programming classes, but I don't remember too much about 21 them, and I don't use them now. 22 THE COURT: Anything about that situation in your education that would keep you from giving a fair trial? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 24 25 THE COURT: Anybody else on that row? Third row?

Yes, your name? 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Carole Mitchell. I work with the 3 University of Richmond, and I help with the programming and the 4 setup of all the coding for our SunGard Banner system and our 5 Recruitment PLUS system. 6 THE COURT: Anything about that that would keep you 7 from giving a fair trial to these parties? 8 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 9 THE COURT: Thank you. Anybody else on that row? Last row, anybody on the last row. Yes, Mr. Pollack? 10 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. I'm a career programmer analyst. My undergraduate degree is in mathematics 12 13 and computer science, and, of course, I've had training in many different systems, both --14 15 THE COURT: Have you had training in either ePlus or 16 Lawson? 17 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Neither of those. 18 THE COURT: How about those that I asked you about 19 earlier? I guess you haven't had any training in those either. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Nothing in that list. 21 THE COURT: Thank you very much. Anything about that 22 situation, your training, your background that would keep you 23 from giving a fair trial to these parties? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 25 THE COURT: On down the road, back row, anybody?

Okay, anybody I missed? 2 Has anybody ever invented a process which uses 3 computer software and computer hardware components? That is, 4 have you invented it yourself? If you have, let me know. going down the front row, second row, third row, fourth row. 5 No inventors. 6 7 Whether you invented something or not, have you or 8 anybody in your family applied for a patent on anything? 9 doesn't make any difference whether it was computer software or anything. Have you applied for a patent? First row, nobody. 10 11 Second row? No. Yes. Ms. Hribar. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My brother-in-law holds several 13 patents as a chemical engineer. I couldn't tell you exactly what they are for. 14 15 THE COURT: Has he said anything, good, bad, or 16 indifferent, about the process of obtaining patents or enforcing patents? 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not at all. 19 THE COURT: You don't have any experience that would 20 keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties? 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. 22 THE COURT: Thank you. On down that row. ma'am. 23 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My father --25 THE COURT: Your name?

PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Erika Powell. 1 THE COURT: Just a minute, please, ma'am. 2 3 THE CLERK: Number 49. 4 THE COURT: Ms. Powell, what? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My dad and his team have worked on a couple of patents for Alcoa and Reynolds. 6 7 THE COURT: All right. Has he said anything about 8 the process? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just a little bit, but nothing that would interfere. 10 THE COURT: All right. You could be fair? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 12 13 THE COURT: Even if he criticized the Patent Office? 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 15 Thank you. Anybody else? All right. THE COURT: 16 Has anybody been involved ever before in any way, as a plaintiff, a defendant, or a witness in a patent infringement 17 18 case? If the answer is yes, let me know. We've gone through 19 all of the panel, and the answer is no. 20 How about have you ever been involved in a suit to 21 enforce intellectual property rights such as trademarks or 22 trade secrets or something of that nature that's not a patent, 23 whether you've been a plaintiff or defendant or witness? the answer is yes, let me know. All right. All the way 24 25 through, the answer is no.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
Have you ever been involved as a plaintiff, a
defendant, or a witness in any civil case whatsoever, whether
personal injury case or contract case or lease, anything like
that? If the answer is yes, let me know. Your name?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: John Apostle. Personal injury
case, Your Honor.
         THE COURT: Anything about your experience that would
keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
         THE COURT: Thank you very much. Your name, sir?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Charles Asbury.
         THE COURT: All right, sir.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I've been a witness in many cases
being a Virginia state trooper.
         THE COURT: Were any of them civil cases?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
         THE COURT: Oh, yeah, sure. As in personal injury
cases, for example.
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
         THE COURT: Is there anything about your experience
in that situation, or any of those situations, that would keep
you from giving a fair trial here, Mr. Asbury?
         PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.
         THE COURT:
                     Thank you. On down the road.
ma'am. That's Ms. Carrington.
```

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Personal injury case. 2 THE COURT: Is there anything about that experience 3 that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these parties? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 5 THE COURT: Thank you. On down the front row. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jerry Dawson, civil case, 6 7 contract dispute. 8 THE COURT: All right. Is there anything about that 9 experience that would keep you from giving a fair trial? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 11 THE COURT: All right, thank you. Second row, 12 anybody in the second row? Yes, ma'am. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kathryn Horne. I was in a 14 personal injury case. 15 THE COURT: Ms. Horne, anything about that experience 16 that would give you a problem with giving these folks a fair 17 trial? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. 19 THE COURT: Thank you. On down the row, next row, 20 all the way across. 21 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Joyce Marsh, personal injury. 22 THE COURT: All right, Ms. Marsh, anything about your situation that would keep you from giving a fair trial to these 23 parties? 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir.

THE COURT: Thank you. On down the back row. All right, back row, anybody involved in a lawsuit as a plaintiff, defendant, or witness?

Have you, any member of your family, or close friend ever been employed by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, also known as the PTO? If the answer is yes, let me hear from you. Second row? Third row? Fourth row? Nobody. All right.

Has anybody ever been employed by or been an officer or owned any stock in Fisher Scientific procurement? If the answer is yes, stand and let me know. The answer is no.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, as I told you, this case is expected to go perhaps three weeks. I need to know now whether any of you have any special disability or problem that would keep you from sitting as a fair and impartial juror in this case for these people to decide these issues over that period of time.

Now, I'm not going to go into all of the situations. We have, for example, had people who have difficulty hearing, and they just simply don't feel comfortable deciding cases on the basis of things they've heard. We've also had people who have had difficulty seeing in a case where there's a lot to be looked at in the way of evidence, not necessarily read but looked at and examined. They don't feel comfortable deciding on the basis of what they see.

I'm not suggesting those things are disabilities, but

in their case they did, so that kind of thing is the kind of thing I'm talking about. In addition, we've had people who are on pain medication and they simply cannot function. They are kind of fuzzy because of the pain medication. We've had other people who actually are in pain and don't take medication, and because they are in pain, they simply cannot focus their attention on what people are saying and don't feel comfortable making decisions.

We had one lady on one occasion who said she could serve the first several days of the tile, but she didn't think she could do the rest of it because she was going to have open-heart surgery and wouldn't be back. There are different reasons. I'm not going to try to go through all of them.

Don't you think for one minute that everybody in here doesn't know that service for a significant period of time presents a burden for everybody. We know that.

That's not the kind of burden I'm talking about. I'm talking about some special disability or problem that would keep you from giving these people a fair trial and being a fair and impartial juror. So if you have anything like that, I'm going to take it up here at the sidebar. Mr. Langford -- I mean at the bench, and Mr. Langford will guide you up here.

The rest of you are going to be subjected to cruel and unusual punishment because we're going to turn on the white noise system that somebody decided was effective in keeping the

rest of you from hearing what's going on up here, but I think mostly what it does is irritate you, so I'm sorry, because it 2 3 does irritate me. All right. Lawyers come up here please. 4 Whoever is handling the challenges, come on up. You 5 come here, you come here, and leave a place in the middle. Come up please, ma'am. And then and y'all need to talk into 6 7 this thing. Here comes the noise. Here, speak into this. 8 (Discussion at sidebar as follows:) 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Lisa Briscoe. 10 THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Briscoe, what is your 11 situation. 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have anxiety attacks and also 13 take Tramadol for my back which causes me to get sleepy sometimes, drowsy. 14 15 THE COURT: Let me ask you this: Sometimes when I take extra strength Tylenol, I want to fall up stand and move 16 around a little bit, I'm okay. Can you do that, or does taking 17 18 the medicine make you real drowsy? 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, this kind does. I can't 20 stand as much or sit too long. This is what I take like every 21 four hours or every six hours. THE COURT: You do? 22 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 24 THE COURT: Anybody have any questions of Ms. 25 Briscoe?

1 MR. MERRITT: I just wanted to clarify what medication she's taking. 2 3 THE COURT: Tramadol, T-r-a-m-a-d-o-l, and it does 4 affect you. 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. 6 THE COURT: Thank you. You may go back to your seat. 7 All right. Look at that line. I told you. Come on up. 8 just a minute. All right, that is Ms. Downs; right? What is 9 your situation? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I'm afraid I'm not going to 10 11 be very partial to anything in the court system. My son is in prison, and we just had a hearing for a reconsideration of his 12 13 sentencing up in Maryland, and I just -- and it was turned down, and all this was in December. It's just left me very 14 15 unfair towards the court system. 16 THE COURT: Now, that was in Maryland; it wasn't in the federal court? 17 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it was not. 19 THE COURT: And it didn't involve patents. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, it did not. 21 THE COURT: It involved criminal law. 22 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 23 THE COURT: Do you think you could put all that aside and decide this case, because what you're really deciding is 24 25 not the court. You are deciding the rights between ePlus and

```
Lawson, not anything to do with the court. Do you think you
 2
     could be fair?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would certainly try.
 4
               THE COURT: Yes, I know, but could you, because you
 5
     have to say -- in order for them to be comfortable, they have
 6
     to be comfortable knowing either you could or couldn't, and
 7
     it's okay if you can't, but if you can, let us know. If you
 8
     can't, you let us know, too.
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I will.
10
               THE COURT: You can? All right, okay. Thank you.
11
     Okay. Your name?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Erika Powell.
13
               THE COURT: All right, Ms. Powell, what is your
     situation?
14
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't know if it will be an
16
     issue, but I have to go back to school on the 15th.
17
               THE COURT: Where do you go to school?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: UVa.
19
               THE COURT: You all don't go to class up there
20
     anyway, do you? Anybody have any questions for Ms. Powell?
21
               MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
22
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: All right, thank you.
               THE COURT: All right. This lady. What is your
24
25
     name?
```

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Monica Redwood.
 1
 2
               THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Redwood, what is your
 3
     situation.
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have scheduled Rituxan
 5
     infusions coming up for rheumatoid arthritis.
 6
               THE COURT: You have scheduled what?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Rituxan infusions.
 8
               THE COURT: What does that mean?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's for treatment for rheumatoid
 9
10
     arthritis. It's IV drugs. It takes about six hours.
11
               THE COURT: Do you know when it's scheduled?
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Tomorrow.
13
               THE COURT: Now, is that something you have to have a
     regular schedule, or could it be rescheduled for next Monday,
14
15
     January 10th?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It's a two-step process. I had
17
     my first infusion two weeks ago.
18
               THE COURT: So you need to take this one on this
19
     date.
20
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right.
21
               THE COURT: Anybody have any questions?
               MR. McDONALD: No.
22
23
               THE COURT: Thank you, ma'am. Okay. Your name is
     what?
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Brenton Carson.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: All right, Mr. Carson, what is your
     situation.
 2
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm just bringing this up.
 4
     place of work is only paying me for seven days. So if it's
 5
     going to be three weeks, I'll be living on $3 a day for two
     weeks, I guess, but I can make do if actually necessary.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Would the fact that you're not getting
 8
     paid keep you from giving a fair trial at this point? Where do
 9
     you work?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work at the Richmond SPCA.
               THE COURT: And Ms. Starr is going -- have you asked
11
12
     her? She's a lawyer. I can't believe she wouldn't pay.
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I know, right. I have the jury
     duty written out, and in the handbook it says seven days.
14
15
               THE COURT: Have you asked them?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I haven't, because I wasn't
16
     really thinking that it would last that long.
17
18
               THE COURT: Well, we didn't tell you.
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right, but, I mean, if she is
20
     willing to pay, or -- I mean, you know, I could make do if
21
     absolutely necessary. It's not going to make me biased --
22
               THE COURT: Living on $3 a day is kind of hard.
23
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Right, it is tough.
               THE COURT: Anybody have any questions?
24
25
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
```

1 THE COURT: Okay, Mr. Carson. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I appreciate it. 3 THE COURT: All right, next. I know a lot of you 4 have problems, but just remember the jury system requires your 5 service, so we are not going to be but so understanding. Yes, Ms. Boyd, what is your situation? 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have a mentally challenged 8 sister that lives with me, and I am her caregiver, and she has 9 doctors' appointments for the next three weeks that -- she doesn't take good to strangers, and I have no control. 10 11 THE COURT: Is there anybody else who can take her? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I left her with a friend this 13 morning, and it's not a good -- she doesn't do well with strangers or different people. She never has. 14 15 THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 17 THE COURT: All right. 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Peggy Carrington. 19 THE COURT: Yes, Ms. Carrington. 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I work for a cardiologist. 21 would be a great hardship for me to be away from our practice 22 for three weeks. 23 THE COURT: What do you do there? 24 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a nurse. THE COURT: Well, if you were called, required to 25

```
serve, would you be resentful and not be able to give a fair
 2
     trial?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir, I wouldn't be resentful.
 4
               THE COURT: And you'd be able to give a fair trial
 5
     even if you're required to serve?
 6
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
 7
               THE COURT: Okay, thank you.
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Good morning.
 9
               THE COURT: Your name?
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kevin Lewis, Sr. The only
11
     problem I have is that I tend to lose interest, not pay
12
     attention. I work out in the field. I'm the type of person
13
     that works out in the field. I do maintenance work, and I'm
     constantly moving. For me to sit in one place, I would lose
14
     interest. My mind would just flare up into space, and I feel
15
     that that would cause me not to be able to judge this case the
16
17
     correct way, because I don't want to hurt anything.
18
               THE COURT: Anybody have any questions?
19
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
20
               MR. McDONALD: No.
21
               THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am. Your name?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Denise Robinson.
22
23
               THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Robinson, let me get to you.
24
               THE CLERK: 53, Your Honor.
25
               MR. MERRITT: 54, I believe.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: All right, Ms. Robinson.
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I will be beginning classes at
 3
     Virginia Commonwealth January 18th.
 4
               THE COURT: All right, anybody have any questions?
 5
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
 6
               THE COURT: All right, go ahead. Thank you.
 7
               All right, come up and speak into this little black
 8
     thing here. Your name?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Carole Mitchell. I am under
10
     doctor's care. I'm doing physical therapy twice a week for my
11
     right knee and my left achilles.
               THE COURT: When does that end?
12
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: When it gets well. We're not
     there.
14
               THE COURT: When did it start?
15
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: In November.
17
               THE COURT: Do they have hours in the morning and
18
     late in the evening?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They have hours until 5:00.
20
               THE COURT: They don't have evening hours or early
21
     morning?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Not that I know of. I've been
     going during work or before work?
23
24
               THE COURT: Where is it?
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Henrico Doctors' Parham.
```

1 THE COURT: They usually start about 7:30. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They start at 7:30. 3 THE COURT: Could you do that and go get your 4 physical therapy morning in the morning? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I could, but if I'm going to be here for three weeks, I'm going to have to go to work before I 6 7 come, and I'm going to have to go to work after. I work in the 8 admissions office at the University of Richmond. Our deadline 9 is January 15th. 10 THE COURT: Well, if you had to serve, would you be 11 resentful and unable to be fair? 12 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I could be fair. I could be fair 13 absolutely. 14 THE COURT: All right, thank you very much. What is your name? 15 16 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Desiree Roberts. 17 THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Roberts, what's your situation? 18 You are a teacher. 19 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, I'm a teacher. I teach four-year-olds. We're getting ready for a standardized test 20 21 for them. I am also in the process of adopting a child that I have a meeting for, and I have to take a test on the 18th for 22 23 my degree. So I think that all of this right at the time, I don't know that I would be impartial to coming to trial every 24 day for two weeks. 25

```
1
               THE COURT: What degree are you getting?
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: It is in literacy and culture.
 3
     I'll be a reading specialist.
 4
               THE COURT: You are taking a test what?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: A standardized test on the 18th,
 6
     January 18th.
 7
               THE COURT: For you?
 8
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: For me, yes.
 9
               THE COURT: What is the adoption? I didn't
10
     understand that.
11
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I am in the process of adopting a
     child.
12
13
               THE COURT: What does that have to do with being
     here?
14
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: We are scheduling meetings with
16
     the families.
17
               THE COURT: But you can schedule those around --
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I could.
19
               THE COURT: And these four-years-old --
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm a teacher.
20
21
               THE COURT: There's other teachers, aren't there?
22
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah.
               THE COURT: They help out with you, don't you have a
23
     teacher's aid and all that?
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I do, yes, I do.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: How about this test on the 18th, can you
 2
     reschedule that?
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I guess if I told them I had to
 4
     go to court, I could.
 5
               THE COURT: Would doing all that or having to do any
     of that, put off these meetings or reschedule a test, would
 6
 7
     that keep you in any way from giving a fair trial to these
 8
     parties?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I would do the best that I could.
10
               THE COURT: I know that, and I don't have any
11
     question about it, but would you be sitting there saying I
     don't like these people because I have to be --
12
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, no, I wouldn't say that.
               THE COURT: Or I can't be fair because I'm going to
14
     be mad about the whole thing?
15
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I wouldn't say that.
17
               THE COURT: What would you think then?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, you know what I would be
19
     thinking? I'm really concerned about my four-year-olds because
20
     we're getting -- they are getting ready to take a test
     themselves on how much they have learned from September until
21
     now. I would be concerned --
22
23
               THE COURT: Does that affect your performance, grade
     as performance as a teacher if they don't do well?
24
25
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes.
                                         I would think it has
```

```
something to do with it, yes.
 2
               THE COURT: Anybody have any questions?
 3
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Okay.
 4
               THE COURT: Your name is what ma'am?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Flora Robinson.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: Okay, Ms. Robinson, what is your
 8
     situation?
 9
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm willing to serve. I have
     some health issues.
10
               THE COURT: What problems did you want to tell me
11
12
     about?
13
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: First of all, I have triple
14
     bypass.
15
               THE COURT: When did you have it?
16
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: 14 years ago.
17
               THE COURT: Are you doing okay with it?
18
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm doing okay.
19
               THE COURT: And then you had what other kind of
20
     problems?
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Kidney problem, diabetes, high
     blood pressure. I take 11 medicines a day plus two as needed,
22
     and I have a doctor's appointment on the 11th and the 18th. As
23
     I said, I'm willing, but it may be a concentration problem due
24
25
     to the unusual case.
```

1 THE COURT: And your current medical situation is dealing with diabetes, is it? 2 3 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Diabetes. 4 THE COURT: Is it type two or type one? 5 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Type two. 6 THE COURT: And you take medicine? 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 8 THE COURT: And these doctors' appointments, can they 9 be rescheduled? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: They can, yes. 11 THE COURT: If you had to serve, would you be able to 12 give a fair trial knowing that all these -- that you're going 13 to have to reschedule your doctors' appointments? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 14 15 THE COURT: Is there anything else you need to let me 16 know? You said you had bypass surgery. Is your heart giving 17 you any problems? 18 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I see my heart doctor on the 19 18th. I see my kidney doctor on the 11th. So all of it is 20 affecting different organs. 21 THE COURT: So do you have any problems with your 22 heart right now? 23 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Just -- no problem. I take the 24 medicine and see him every, you know... THE COURT: As long as you take the medicine, you are 25

okay? 1 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Uh-huh. 3 THE COURT: Anybody have any questions? 4 MR. MERRITT: Ms. Robinson, do you have any medical 5 requirements or medication requirements that would cause you to need to take a break after any certain period of time? 6 7 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No. I just take medicine 8 different times during the day. 9 THE COURT: All right. Thank you. Yes, sir, what is your name? 10 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Gardner Divers. 11 12 THE COURT: All right, Mr. Divers. 13 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have no problems serving. didn't know how long we'd be sitting at a time. 14 15 THE COURT: Sitting down? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Sitting down. I have restless 16 leg syndrome, and I get very uncomfortable after sitting for 17 18 awhile. 19 THE COURT: Any time you want to stand up, we'll put you in a place where you can stand up if you want to. 20 21 chief justice of the United States had back problems. He used to stand up, hear cases standing up, so I figure we can do that 22 for you. 23 24 We'll take a break in the morning, and you can walk 25 around a little bit. I can put a chair right over here or

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

right down at the end if you're not comfortable in one of the jury chairs, and any time you need to stand up, you can stand up. I will put you in the back row so you wouldn't block anybody else's view or on the end. Would that be okay? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. You say there are breaks for the restroom? THE COURT: A break in the morning, and break for lunch, and then break in the afternoon. The general rule is that if anybody needs to have a comfort break, they raise their hand and we go. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: May I ask one other question? You asked a question earlier, and I didn't think about it. You had asked a question about being part of a court case. THE COURT: Yes, as a plaintiff or a defendant or a witness. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: My company I work for, I would take people to court for nonpayment of their loans. THE COURT: Did you have to testify? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir. THE COURT: Anything about that experience that would keep you from giving a fair trial here? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. THE COURT: Anybody have any questions of Mr. Divers? MR. McDONALD: No, sir. MR. MERRITT: No, sir.

1 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. 2 THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, ma'am, your name is 3 what? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Constance Campbell. I wasn't 5 going to say anything, but I was sitting there thinking, I do have a bit of attention deficit disorder, and I do take 6 7 Ritalin® for that. 8 THE COURT: When you take it, does that help you? 9 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, yeah. 10 THE COURT: Can you do all right with it? 11 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Oh, sure. 12 THE COURT: Do you feel like you would be able to pay attention? 13 14 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think so. I would really like 15 to do it, actually. 16 THE COURT: You say, I think so. I need to be 17 relatively sure, and I know you would try to do it, but have 18 you had to do protracted focusing on issues before and you take 19 your medicine and you do okay with it? 20 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. 21 THE COURT: So you feel like you could sit fairly and 22 impartially here, and even if you had to stay off and on for three weeks, if you had adequate breaks, could go home at night 23 and sleep and rest, could you be fair? 24 25 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yeah. I mean, you usually get

```
out of here at 5:00?
 2
               THE COURT: Between 5:00 and 6:00. Where do you live
 3
     here?
 4
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Henrico. Near West End.
 5
               THE COURT: Not too far.
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I think I'd be all right. I just
 6
 7
     thought I'd mentioned it.
 8
               THE COURT: Well, thank you. I told you, that's what
 9
     I want to know. Anybody have any questions?
10
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
11
               MR. McDONALD: No, sir.
               THE COURT: Okay, thanks. All right, let's go down
12
13
     them one by one. Ms. Boyd, she has the mentally challenged
     sister who doesn't do well with other people. I'm inclined to
14
15
     believe that's cause. Do you agree or not?
16
               MR. MERRITT: I agree.
17
               MR. McDONALD: I agree.
18
               THE COURT: So that's number six. Ms. Campbell, I
19
     think she's fine, the one who was just up her.
20
               MR. McDONALD: You skipped over Ms. Briscoe. She was
21
     the one --
22
               THE COURT: Oh, thank you very much. She has the
     anxiety problems and takes medicine that makes her drowsy. I'm
23
     inclined -- she was pretty adamant that she can't function, so
24
     I had think we recuse her, number seven. Do you all agree?
25
```

```
1
               MR. McDONALD: I agree, Your Honor.
 2
               MR. MERRITT: Yes, sir.
 3
               THE COURT: Ms. Campbell, the one who was just up
 4
     here, I think is okay. Do you agree?
 5
               MR. MERRITT: Yes, sir.
 6
               MR. McDONALD: I agree.
 7
               THE COURT: Mr. Carrington who is a cardiologist
 8
     nurse -- I'm not -- I don't think that's cause. Cardiologists
 9
     have plenty of people they can call on. It's a hardship, but
10
     that's all it is, and I'm not inclined to find that's cause.
11
     Anybody disagree with that?
12
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
13
               MR. McDONALD: I don't disagree with that.
               THE COURT: Mr. Carson, the guy who works for the
14
15
     SPCA, $3 a day is hard to live on. What do you think?
16
               MR. MERRITT: I'd be inclined to let him go.
17
               THE COURT: What do you think?
18
               MR. McDONALD: I'm on the fence on that one as well,
19
     Your Honor. I would be okay with letting him go.
20
               THE COURT: I think, as a general proposition, he
21
     might not be able to focus is what I'm concerned about.
22
     think he's not unwilling to do it, but I think his mind would
     be on other things.
23
               All right, then that brings us to Mr. Divers.
24
25
     okay, number 20. Ms. Downs, she's the one who had the child
```

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

who was in Maryland and didn't like the system, and I tried to rehabilitate her, and she finally said that she was okay, but I fear maybe that was in response to the black robe. MR. McDONALD: And the relentless cross-examination. THE COURT: And relentless cross-examination. MR. MERRITT: It was a reluctant okay at best. THE COURT: I don't think -- I think she really is bitter about it, and she could take it out on anybody depending on what happens. I don't think it's safe. All right, so that's number 21. And Mr. Lewis, I will have to tell you that in all of the days that I have been trying cases and on the bench, I have never heard anybody use the float-off, but that guy was for real. He is going to float off. I think he's entitled to cause. Don't you all? MR. McDONALD: I think that was one of the best speeches he ever gave. THE COURT: Or at least the longest. MR. MERRITT: Very effective. MR. McDONALD: I would agree with that. THE CLERK: 40, Your Honor. THE COURT: 40, Ms. Mitchell, she is the one that has to go for therapy twice a week, day care, and all that. I mean doctors' care, and she's at the admissions department at the University of Richmond. What do you all think about her?

```
She'd have to get up and get her physical therapy in the
 1
 2
     morning before she got here, and she said she'd have to go to
 3
     work before.
               MR. MERRITT: I'd be concerned about her.
 4
 5
     working before, she's working after, and she's doing physical
     therapy two days a week during.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: You all believe she's entitled to cause?
 8
     Both of you?
 9
               MR. MERRITT: We do.
10
               MR. McDONALD: We'd agree with that.
11
               THE COURT: Okay, and then Powell, 49, she starts
12
     school on the 15th, and you all agree that that's cause?
13
               MR. MERRITT: Yes.
               MR. McDONALD: I would agree with that.
14
15
               THE COURT: And the lady, number 51, who is getting a
16
     doctors -- she has to have that infusion tomorrow, and I don't
17
     want to stop the trial.
18
               MR. MERRITT: My father went through that. I'm quite
19
     familiar with it.
20
               THE COURT: Those are times that you can't put those
21
     off.
22
               MR. McDONALD: I would agree with that.
23
               THE COURT: Ms. Roberts, she's the lady who is the
     teacher and going through an adoption and is taking her own
24
25
     test, and she said she thought the combination of things,
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

combination of things might make it hard for her to be fair. think she tried to say she could be fair at the end, and she could reschedule her degree test, but she's worried about four-year-olds. She raised that two or three times. you say? MR. MERRITT: I think the biggest concern I heard her mention is whether she'd be attentive because she was --THE COURT: That's what she said. MR. McDONALD: Her concern about the four-year-olds and lack of focus is my concern. I think you're right. And Ms. Flora THE COURT: Robinson, she was the lady who has got doctors' appointments on the 11th and 18th, but she is the one who had the heart problem sometime ago but has been okay, and she takes diabetes medication. What do you all say? She would have to change her appointments. It's a routine cardiology appointment, but what do you all say? MR. McDONALD: She mentioned diabetes issues as well as I think some kidney treatment. THE COURT: Medication. Anybody who has diabetes has some kidney prospects, and she is apparently taking medication for both, so what do you think? I think she'd like to do it but --MR. McDONALD: I think she's trying her best, but I

think it's going to be an impediment to her ability to serve.

1 THE COURT: Do you? 2 MR. MERRITT: I think that's correct. 3 THE COURT: I agree. And Ms. Robinson, 54, is going 4 to start school on the 18th as a student. Do you agree she's 5 out? 6 MR. McDONALD: Yes, sir. 7 THE COURT: And that's it. 8 MR. MERRITT: Judge, we had one more matter --9 THE CLERK: Constance Campbell. 10 THE COURT: She's okay. She said she'd be okay, and 11 they agreed on her. 12 THE CLERK: Okay. 13 THE COURT: Now, do you all have any challenges for cause other than what I just mentioned? 14 15 MR. MERRITT: Your Honor, I want to make a disclosure 16 and mention a couple of others. By way of disclosure, juror 17 number three, John Apostle, is a lawyer at Genworth, although I 18 don't know if it affects his ability to be fair at all. 19 THE COURT: Is that your client? 20 MR. MERRITT: I have several partners who when we 21 circulated these names identified John Apostle as someone they 22 knew. Ford Stephens, who is known to you, had lunch with him 23 just a couple weeks ago. THE COURT: Mr. Apostle, would you come up here 24 25 please, sir.

```
Mr. Apostle, apparently you are a lawyer with
 1
 2
     Genworth.
 3
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Correct. I'm a chief compliance
 4
     officer, sir.
 5
               THE COURT: And you know lawyers in Christian &
     Barton?
 6
 7
               THE WITNESS: I don't think -- I may. I can't tell
 8
     you.
 9
               MR. MERRITT: Gaines Tavenner.
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I used to work with Gaines, yes.
11
               MR. MERRITT: Ford Stephens.
12
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I have been at a seminar with
     Ford Stephens.
13
14
               THE COURT: Would the fact that you know those
15
     people, would that keep you in any way from giving a fair trial
16
     to these parties?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir, Your Honor.
18
               THE COURT: You worked with Tavenner where?
19
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Gaines Tavenner and I were both
     corporate counsel at Signet Bank in 1993/'94. I left Signet
20
     late '94.
21
22
               THE COURT: Okay. Any questions?
23
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
24
               THE COURT:
                           Thank you. Number 33, Mr. Kiersarsky.
25
     Mr. Kiersarsky. You told Mr. Langford you know some of the
```

```
lawyers or think you do?
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Well, I worked in the insurance
 3
     claims industry for 21 years.
 4
               THE COURT: Are you an adjuster?
 5
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes. I'm a supervisor now.
 6
               THE COURT: What company?
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Hanover Insurance, Ohio Casualty,
 8
     and National Grange.
               THE COURT: And do you know any of these lawyers?
 9
10
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, but we've retained -- my
11
     company has used Troutman Sanders.
               THE COURT: Would that keep you from giving a fair
12
13
     trial to this parties?
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, I don't handle Virginia. I
14
15
     just wanted to let you know.
16
               THE COURT: I'm glad to know it. Anybody have any
17
     questions?
18
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
19
               THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Kiersarsky. Ms.
20
     Carrington.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: That's all right. I told you, I'd rather
22
23
     know later --
24
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I remembered that my son-in-law
25
     was previously employed by Christian & Barton.
```

```
1
               THE COURT: Who is your son-in-law?
 2
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Brian Boggs. He no longer is
 3
     there. He's with Dominion Power now.
 4
               THE COURT: Is there anything about his being there
 5
     or the fact that he left there that would keep you from giving
     a fair trial to the parties?
 6
 7
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: No, sir. I just needed to let
 8
     you know.
 9
               THE COURT: I know that, and I told you I'd rather
     have later knowledge than not. That's fine. Anybody have any
10
11
     questions?
12
               MR. MERRITT: No, sir.
13
               THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Carrington. We've got one
14
     more.
15
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Jon Meyers.
16
               THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Meyers, what is your situation?
17
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm just asking. Mine's a
18
     business issue, but if this thing goes three or four weeks --
19
               THE COURT: It could go three, it could go four, but
20
     I doubt it.
21
               PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I was going to wait to see if you
     pulled me or not, but my issue is I'm a sole proprietor.
22
23
     have a presentation on the 24th of January for a new account,
24
     and --
25
               THE COURT: You'd probably have to move that.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

```
PROSPECTIVE JUROR: If I move it, I'd lose the deal.
I've got no choice. I'm competing against two other companies,
and that's the day the board makes the decision.
          THE COURT: Would that keep you from giving a fair
trial here today if you were to do that?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm sorry?
          THE COURT: Would that keep you from giving a fair
trial --
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Begrudging, you mean? No.
                                                         It's
just I'd lose the deal.
          THE COURT: You are a sole proprietor in what area?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I'm in financial services.
competing for a contract, and I've got no one else I can give
it to to do.
          THE COURT: It says you were a sales manager here.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Same difference. Of a financial
services group. Independent contractor for them.
          THE COURT: Independent contractor?
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Yes, sir.
          THE COURT: All right. Anybody have any questions?
         MR. MERRITT: I just want to confirm the date of that
presentation.
          PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Monday, the 24th. I think that's
a Monday.
          THE COURT: That's right. Thank you very much.
```

```
would be right near the end of the trial.
 2
               MR. MERRITT: I would think.
 3
               MR. McDONALD: I think we're trying to be done before
 4
     that.
 5
               THE COURT: The other thing is, if he's chosen, we
     will not go on the 24th given that he said he would lose the
 6
 7
     whole deal, because I think losing a deal is reason to excuse
 8
     somebody. So we wouldn't go on that date if we're not
 9
     finished. Okay, is that all right with you?
10
               MR. McDONALD: Yes.
11
               THE COURT: Otherwise we're okay with it.
               MR. MERRITT: Yes. We did have one other one we
12
13
     wanted to raise as a possible strike for cause. Number 48,
     Pollack.
14
15
               THE COURT: Mr. Pollack, he is the programmer
16
     analyst.
17
               MR. MERRITT: I believe he mentioned in years past he
18
     had worked for IBM. Now, we may have misheard that.
19
               THE COURT: He was an IBM programmer in college.
               MR. MERRITT: Given the TV/2 connection here and the
20
21
     time during which he worked for IBM, I don't know if there's a
     connection there or not.
22
23
               THE COURT: Mr. Pollack, could you come up here,
24
     please.
25
               He said when I read that list that he never worked
```

1 with them. Come on up, Mr. Pollack. Speak into this. 2 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: Thank you. How do you do? 3 THE COURT: You were a programmer with IBM when? 4 PROSPECTIVE JUROR: That was just two summers in college, so the summer of '69, and summer of '70. 5 6 THE COURT: Did it involve -- what is the name of the 7 system? 8 MR. MERRITT: TV/2. PROSPECTIVE JUROR: I don't believe any of these 9 10 things existed back then. I was a summer programmer doing 11 whatever they had summer programmers doing, and they certainly didn't sell anything I did. 12 13 THE COURT: Did you work with anything from TV/2? PROSPECTIVE JUROR: There was no such thing. 14 THE COURT: Okay, no such thing. Anybody have any 15 16 questions? 17 MR. McDONALD: No. 18 THE COURT: Thank you, Mr. Pollack. Anybody else you 19 all want to challenge for cause? MR. McDONALD: If we go back to Mr. Apostle, with 20 21 respect to John Apostle, juror number three, who, with Genworth Financial, had some connections with Christian & Barton, we 22 would ask he be excused for cause. 23 24 THE COURT: If I recall correctly, he worked with a 25 guy named Gaines Tavenner who is now with you?

1 MR. MERRITT: Who is now a partner. 2 THE COURT: Put at the time he worked with Mr. 3 Tavenner, it was 1993 and '94, and they were both at the Signet 4 Bank which is -- your firm did not represent Signet Bank, did it? 5 6 MR. MERRITT: In the dim past, it may have. 7 hasn't recently. THE COURT: Well, it did. It represented the 8 9 predecessor when Dick Catlett was over there, but that became 10 Signet Bank years after that. 11 MR. McDONALD: I do think he mentioned one other 12 person. He mentioned another name --13 THE COURT: Ford Stephens who met him -- who is a litigator at Christian & Barton, a partner there, I believe. 14 15 MR. MERRITT: He is a partner. 16 THE COURT: And he met him at a seminar, and he said 17 it wouldn't make any different. Have I got that right? Are 18 you challenging --19 MR. McDONALD: There's more than one person he mentioned that had a relationship with Christian & Barton. I'm 20 21 just trying to make sure we recall all of them. MR. MERRITT: Gaines Tavenner and Ford Stephens. 22 23 THE COURT: Any challenge for cause? 24 MR. McDONALD: Yes. THE COURT: You're challenging for cause? 25

```
1
               MR. McDONALD: Yes, we're challenging for cause.
 2
               THE COURT: What do you say?
 3
               MR. MERRITT: Judge, I mean the connection is there.
     That's why we disclosed it voluntarily.
 4
 5
               THE COURT: Do you agree to a challenge for cause?
               MR. MERRITT: We'll agree to it.
 6
 7
               THE COURT: You do? Okay. He just wants to get rid
 8
     of a lawyer, I think. All right, is that it? Let's go.
 9
               Okay, now, you're going to have nine people, and
     remember -- you know how it's done? You've been over it with
10
11
     them?
               THE CLERK: Yes, sir, Your Honor.
12
13
               THE COURT: Mr. Langford, has the jury been given
     sufficient time to have recesses?
14
15
               COURT SECURITY OFFICER: They all went to the
16
     bathroom.
17
               THE COURT: Are you all okay?
18
               MR. McDONALD: A little break for the bathroom, we'd
19
     appreciate it, Your Honor.
               THE COURT: Why don't we get them so we'll take --
20
21
     can you get them a break and get them back in here, and we'll
22
     take 15 minutes, I guess.
23
               (Discussion off the record.)
24
               THE COURT: All right, go ahead and have a seat, and
25
     I'll talk to them.
```

(End of sidebar discussion.)

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, the questioning has now been completed, and we will complete the process of drawing names by lot and then jury selection by the exercise of the challenges, and that won't take long.

However, you all have all been in here a good while, and in addition to that, the lawyers have and I have been in here longer, and the Court staff, than you have, and so --well, actually that's not right. That's in most cases that right, but we've all been in here. We're going to take about a 15-minute break for a little recess, and then we'll get back to the business of selecting the jury, and I expect that will be finished by no later than 12:30.

So we'll take a 15-minute recess. Those of you who need to use the restrooms facilities, there are some on other floors as well as some here, so if you would do that, I would appreciate it.

Mr. Langford, you all can have all of the restroom facilities down that way. The lawyers, Mr. Neal is going to show you where you go for now, just for the this time. Thank you. We'll be in recess.

(Recess taken.)